

Appl. No. 10/663,739  
Amendment dated: May 5, 2004  
Reply to OA of: February 6, 2004

### **REMARKS**

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication that claims 2, 3 and 5-20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Official Action and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the application to restrict it to allowable subject matter thereby making all the claims now present in the application allowable over the prior art of record.

Claim 1 has been amended by adding the limitation of allowable claim 2 therein making claim 1 allowable over the prior art. Claims 2 and 4 have been canceled from the application without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 7, 9, 11-12, and 18-19 have been amended to correct the dependencies since claim 2 has been canceled. All of the dependent claims are either directly or indirectly dependent on allowable claim 1 and these claims are therefore equally allowable over the prior art.

The claims now remaining in the application are claims 1, 3 and 5-20. Applicant most respectfully submits that all the claims now present in the application are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112 and are clearly patentable over the references of record.

The rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention has been carefully considered. The only specific rejection is for lack of proper antecedent basis in claim 1. Claim 1 has been appropriately amended to overcome this rejection. The remaining dependent claims have been reviewed and are believed to be in full compliance with 35 USC 112. It is believed that the rejections of the claims have been obviated by adding the limitation of allowable claim 2 thereby making claim 1 allowable. Claims 2 and 4 have been deleted and the dependencies have been corrected to make dependent claims that were dependent upon claim 2 to now be dependent on claim 1 thereby obviating this aspect

Appl. No. 10/663,739  
Amendment dated: May 5, 2004  
Reply to OA of: February 6, 2004

aspect of the rejection. Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.


The rejection of claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Felknor et al. has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed. Claim 1 has been amended as discussed above and claim 4 has been canceled from the application without prejudice or disclaimer. It is therefore respectfully submitted that these rejections have been obviated by the amendments to the claims and withdrawal of this rejection is hereby most respectfully requested.

The specification and drawings have been reviewed as requested in the Official Action and are believed to be in good order.

In view of the above comments and further amendments to the claims, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims now present in the application are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

By:   
Richard E. Fichter  
Registration No. 26,382

625 Slaters Lane, 4<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Phone: (703) 683-0500  
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

REF:kdd  
A01.wpd

May 5, 2004